

# **Bee Health: Background and Issues for Congress**

Updated January 20, 2015

**Congressional Research Service**

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R43191

## Summary

Bees, both commercially managed honey bees and wild bees, play an important role in global food production. In the United States alone, the value of insect pollination to U.S. agricultural production is estimated at \$16 billion annually, of which about three-fourths is attributable to honey bees. Worldwide, the contribution of bees and other insects to global crop production for human food is valued at about \$190 billion. Given the importance of honey bees and other bee species to food production, many have expressed concern about whether a “pollinator crisis” has been occurring in recent decades.

Over the past few decades there has been heightened concern about the plight of honey bees as well as other bee and pollinator species. Although honey bee colony losses due to bee pests, parasites, and disease are not uncommon, there is the perception that bee health has been declining at a faster rate both in the United States and globally in recent years. This situation gained increased attention in 2006 as some commercial beekeepers began reporting sharp declines in their honey bee colonies. Because of the severity and unusual circumstances of these colony declines, scientists named this phenomenon colony collapse disorder (CCD). Since then, honey bee colonies have continued to dwindle each year, for reasons not solely attributable to CCD. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that CCD may not be the only or even the major cause of bee colony losses in recent years. In the United States, USDA estimates of overwinter colony losses from all causes have averaged more than 30% annually since 2006.

To date, the precise reasons for bee colony losses are not yet known. Reasons cited for bee declines include a wide range of possible factors thought to be affecting pollinator species. These include bee pests and disease, diet and nutrition, genetics, habitat loss and other environmental stressors, agricultural pesticides, and beekeeping management issues, as well as the possibility that bees are being affected by cumulative, multiple exposures and/or the interactive effects of several of these factors.

USDA continues to research possible causes of bee colony losses, and has published a series of reports detailing the agency’s progress in this area. In 2013, USDA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a joint report, *National Stakeholders Conference on Honey Bee Health*. Both USDA and the NAS report conclude that many factors contribute to pollinator declines in North America. A 2007 report by the National Research Council, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, also provides a detailed scientific context concerning bee health.

Following heightened concern over honey bee colony losses in 2006-2007, Congress provided for increased funding for bee research, among other types of farm program support to protect pollinators, as part of the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246). The 2014 farm bill (P.L. 113-79) reauthorized and expanded many of these provisions, addressing managed honey bees and native pollinators as part of the law’s research, conservation, specialty crop, and miscellaneous title provisions. In addition, outside the farm bill, H.R. 4790 would promote conservation practices on millions of acres of highway rights-of-way by encouraging states to reduce mowing and plant for pollinators, providing improved habitat for pollinators and other small wildlife. Also, H.R. 2692 would suspend registrations of neonicotinoids and prohibit new registrations of any pesticide for use unless EPA determines the insecticide would not cause unreasonable adverse effects on pollinators, including honey bees and native bees as well as other pollinators. Another bill, H.R. 5447, would amend U.S. pesticide laws to provide for expedited registration of pesticides that improve bee health, including managing resistance to some parasitic pests.

## Contents

Overview of Selected Bee Species .....	3
Managed Honey Bees .....	3
Wild Bee Species .....	4
Importance of Bee Pollination.....	5
Estimated Economic Value.....	6
Commercial Migratory Beekeeping.....	6
Changes in Bee Populations .....	9
Managed Honey Bees .....	9
U.S. Farms with Bee Colonies .....	10
Honey-Producing Bee Colonies.....	10
Annual “Winter Loss” Survey .....	11
Wild Bee Species .....	14
“Citizen Science” Surveys of Status .....	14
Import and Release of Non- <i>Apis</i> Pollinating Insects .....	15
Endangered Species Act (ESA) Information .....	15
Interactions with Physical Environment .....	16
Factors Affecting Bee Health .....	17
Identified Future Needs .....	20
National Pollinator Health Strategy (“Presidential Memorandum”).....	20
USDA-EPA Joint Report .....	22
USDA Actions and Funding.....	23
CCD Action Plan .....	23
Funding to Address Pollinator Concerns .....	24
Issues for Congress.....	25
Farm Bill Provisions .....	25
Research Provisions .....	26
Conservation Provisions .....	27
Insurance and Disaster Provisions .....	28
Other Farm Bill Provisions .....	29
Other Legislative Proposals .....	30

## Figures

Figure 1. Map of Commercial Pollination.....	7
Figure 2. Weighted Pollination Fee, by Major Sector, Northwest, 2000-2011 .....	9
Figure 3. Managed Honey Bee Colony Losses in the United States .....	13

## Tables

Table 1. Estimated Value of Insect Pollination to U.S. Crop Production, 2010 .....	7
Table 2. Honey-Producing Bee Colonies, 2002-2013 .....	11

## **Contacts**

Author Information.....	31
-------------------------	----

Bees, both commercially managed honey bees and wild unmanaged bees, among many other types of insect pollinators, play an important role in global food production. In the United States, the value of pollination by bees and other insects to U.S. agricultural production is estimated at \$16 billion annually.<sup>1</sup> Most of this estimated value (about 75%) is attributable to honey bees.

Given the importance of bees and other types of pollinators to food production, many have expressed concern about whether a “pollinator crisis” has been occurring in recent decades. Worldwide reports indicate that populations of both managed honey bees and native bees have been declining, with colony losses in some cases described as severe or unusual. In Europe, managed honey bee colony numbers have been declining since the mid-1960s, and individual beekeepers have reported “unusual weakening and mortality in colonies,” particularly during the period spanning winter through spring.<sup>2</sup> According to the United Nations, many insect pollinator species may be becoming rarer, causing some to question whether this is a sign of an overall global biodiversity decline.<sup>3</sup>

In the United States, honey bee colony losses due to bee pests, parasites, pathogens, and disease are not uncommon. This situation gained increased attention in 2006 as some commercial beekeepers began reporting sharp declines in their honey bee colonies. Because of the severity and unusual circumstances of these colony declines, scientists named this phenomenon colony collapse disorder (CCD). This issue was legislatively active in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress and resulted in increased funding for pollinator research, among other types of farm program support to protect pollinators, as part of the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246).<sup>4</sup>

Years later, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that U.S. beekeepers continue to lose honey bee colonies each year. Since 2006, USDA estimates that overwinter colony losses have averaged more than 30% annually.<sup>5</sup> However, USDA reports that bee colonies have continued to decline each winter for reasons not solely attributable to CCD, which is characterized by colony populations that are suddenly lost but no dead bees are present. (For more information on CCD, see text box on next page. Additional discussion is provided in “Factors Affecting Bee Health.”) USDA claims that “beekeepers did not report CCD as a major cause of colony loss” for overwinter losses in most recent surveys.<sup>6</sup> To date, the precise reasons for honey bee colony losses are still unknown.

---

<sup>1</sup> N. W. Calderone, “Insect Pollinated Crops, Insect Pollinators and US Agriculture: Trend Analysis of Aggregate Data for the Period 1992–2009,” *PLoS ONE* 7(5): e37235, May 2012. Updated values are for 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), *Global Honey Bee Colony Disorders and Other Threats to Insect Pollinators*, UNEP Emerging Issues, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> For more information, see CRS Report RL33938, *Honey Bee Colony Collapse Disorder*.

<sup>5</sup> D. vanEngelsdorp et al., “Preliminary Results: Honey Bee Colony Losses in the United States, Winter 2012-2013,” <http://beeinformed.org/2013/05/winter-loss-survey-2012-2013/>.

<sup>6</sup> K. Kaplan, “Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses during Winter of 2012/2013,” May 2013, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/beelosses/index.htm>.

### Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD)

In late 2006, commercial beekeepers along the East Coast began reporting sharp declines in their honey bee colonies. Because of the severity and unusual circumstances of these colony declines, scientists named this phenomenon colony collapse disorder (CCD).

According to USDA: "The defining characteristic of CCD is the disappearance of most, if not all, of the adult honey bees in a colony, leaving behind honey and brood (immature bees confined to cells in the hive, including larvae and pupae) and the absence or dead bees (i.e., no dead bee bodies are present)." Symptoms include the following:

- rapid loss of adult worker bees,
- few or no dead bees found in the hive,
- presence of immature bees (brood),
- small cluster of bees with live queen present, and
- pollen and honey stores in hive.

Another defining characteristic that may be indicative of CCD is low levels of *Varroa* mite and other pathogens, such as *Nosema*, which are generally associated with most winter colony losses.

Since the honey bee is a social insect and colony-oriented, with a complex and organized nesting colony, failing to return to the hive is considered highly unusual. Also, there is little evidence that the hive may have been attacked. In actively collapsing colonies, an insufficient number of adult bees remain to care for the brood. An absence of a large number of dead bees makes an analysis of the causes of CCD difficult. To date, the precise reasons for honey bee colony losses attributable to CCD are still unknown.

Reasons cited for bee colony declines include a wide range of possible factors thought to be negatively affecting pollinator species: bee pests and disease, diet and nutrition, genetics, habitat loss and other environmental stressors, agricultural pesticides, and beekeeping management issues, as well as the possibility that bees are being negatively affected by cumulative, multiple exposures and/or the interactive effects of each of these factors.

As reported by USDA: "While many possible causes for CCD have been proposed, reported, and discussed—both in the scientific literature and popular media—no cause has been proven."

Scientists at USDA and bee labs across the country continue to look for the cause or causes of CCD within four broad categories: (1) pathogens (such as *Nosema ceranae*); (2) parasites (such as *Varroa* mites); (3) environmental stressors (such as pesticides or lack of nectar diversity); and (4) management stressors (such as transportation stress by migratory beekeepers).

**Sources:** K. Kaplan, "Colony Collapse Disorder: An Incomplete Puzzle," *Agricultural Research* (USDA publication), July 2012; K. Kaplan, "Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses during Winter of 2012/2013," May 2013; D. Evans, Yan Ping Chen, et al., "Predictive markers of honey bee colony collapse," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no. 2 (p. e32151), 2012; NRC, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007; USDA, *Colony Collapse Disorder Progress Report*, various years; and comments by Laurie Adams, North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC), in a presentation to congressional staff on June 18, 2012. For other information, see CRS Report RL33938, *Honey Bee Colony Collapse Disorder*.

Reasons cited for honey bee population losses include a wide range of possible factors. Potential identified causes include bee pests and disease, diet and nutrition, genetics, habitat loss and other environmental stressors, agricultural pesticides, and beekeeping management issues, as well as the possibility that bees are being negatively affected by cumulative, multiple exposures and/or the interactive effects of several of these factors.

Aside from the range of potential identified causes for bee colony declines, CRS Report R42855, *Bee Health: The Role of Pesticides*, addresses what role, if any, pesticides play in influencing the health and wellness of bees.

Given continued concerns about the health and well-being of honey bees and other pollinators, this issue has continued to be legislatively active in Congress. Various proposals addressing managed bees and native pollinators were enacted in the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246) and

reauthorized and expanded as part of the 2014 farm bill (P.L. 113-79), in the law's research, conservation, specialty crop, and miscellaneous title provisions.<sup>7</sup>

## Overview of Selected Bee Species

More than 200,000 species of insects (bees, butterflies, moths, flies, wasps, beetles, and ants), bats (and other small mammals), and birds (including hummingbirds) are plant pollinators. This report focuses on bees—both managed honey bees and wild (mostly unmanaged) bee species.

### Managed Honey Bees

Honey bees (*Apis mellifera*; Family: Apidae) are the most well-known bee species. However, honey bees are only one of the world's estimated 17,000 described bee species, and one of the estimated total of 20,000 to 30,000 bee species worldwide.<sup>8</sup> Honey bees are not native to North America, but were introduced by European settlers in the 1600s.

Honey bees are considered to be “social” bees in that they have single egg-laying queen and sterile worker bees that tend to work together in a highly structured social order, consisting of cooperation and division of labor within a colony, as well as the presence of two generations in a single nest at the same time. Social behavior allows bees to be domesticated and managed.

There are an estimated 115,000-125,000 beekeepers in the United States.<sup>9</sup> Most of these (roughly 90,000-100,000) are hobbyists with fewer than 25 hives.<sup>10</sup> Commercial beekeepers tend to have more than 300 hives. They migrate their colonies during the year to provide pollination services to farmers. In the United States, most pollination services are provided by commercial beekeepers.<sup>11</sup>

Some other types of native bees are also managed, such as bumble bees, orchard bees, and alfalfa leaf-cutting bees. Some of these bees (such as bumble bees and some types of stingless bees) exhibit some of the social behaviors commonly associated with honey bees. Some bumble bee species are managed in controlled environments to pollinate greenhouse tomatoes. Others are valued as primary or supplementary pollinators for members of the squash family such as cucumbers, watermelons, and cantaloupes. Some species of meliponine bees (commonly called stingless bees), which are mostly found in the tropics, were widely cultivated by Native Americans in Central and South America before the introduction of honey bees from Europe.<sup>12</sup> Roughly 500 species of bees native to North America show some degree of social behavior.

---

<sup>7</sup> For more information, see CRS Report R43076, *The 2014 Farm Bill (P.L. 113-79): Summary and Side-by-Side*.

<sup>8</sup> National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council (NRC), *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007, p. 36; and S. Fecht, “Hive and Seek: Domestic Honeybees Keep Disappearing, but Are Their Wild Cousins in Trouble, Too?” *Scientific American*, May 8, 2012.

<sup>9</sup> National Honey Board, “Beekeepers and Honeybee Colonies,” <http://www.honey.com/nhb/media/press-kit/>. Data from 2012 industry survey, *Bee Culture* magazine.

<sup>10</sup> A colony of bees is composed of between 250 and 50,000 individual bees (D. Sammataro and A. Avitabile, *The Beekeepers Handbook*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Most larger healthy managed hives have between 20,000 and 50,000 bees.

<sup>11</sup> These operations are able to supply honey bee colonies during the critical phase of a crop's bloom cycle, when bees pollinate a crop as they fly from flower to flower collecting nectar and pollen, which they carry back to the nest.

<sup>12</sup> The shift by beekeepers to honey bees for more intensive production has also reduced the number of stingless bees.

## Wild Bee Species

An estimated 4,000 species of bees are native to North America.<sup>13</sup> With few exceptions, most of these are wild and not managed. Most types of wild bees are “solitary” bees—estimated at about 3,500 species—and do not have long-lived colonies.<sup>14</sup> Data and information on native bees are more limited than information on managed bees.

The five most common families of native bees in North America are Andrenidae, Apidae, Colletidae, Halictidae, and Megachilidae. Andrenid bees are all ground nesters, and mostly comprise a large family of dark, nondescript bees, although some are colorful. Bees in the large Apidae family include not only honey bees, but also bumble bees (such as *Bombus* spp.), carpenter bees, squash or gourd bees, and others. Compared to most native species, bumble bees (*Bombus*) are better studied. There are 239 species of bumble bees worldwide; of these, 60 species are found in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.<sup>15</sup>

### Classification of Bees

Kingdom	Animalia—Animal
Phylum	Arthropoda—Arthropods
Class	Insecta—insects, hexapoda
Order	Hymenoptera—ants, bees, wasps
Superfamily	Apoidea—bees, sphecoid wasps, apoid wasps
Family	Andrenidae—andrenid bees, andrenids
Family	Apidae—honey bees, bumble bees, carpenter bees, squash bees, stingless bees
Family	Colletidae—colletid bees, plasterer bees, yellow-faced bees
Family	Halictidae—halictid bees, sweat bees
Family	Megachilidae—leafcutting bees, orchard bees, mason bees, resin bees
Family	Melittidae—melittid bees, melittids

**Source:** Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS). ITIS is supported by a consortium of federal and international agencies and scientific organizations to provide authoritative taxonomic information on known plant and animal species. Available at <http://www.itis.gov/>. Condensed and slightly modified by CRS to include more common names.

Bees in the smaller Colletidae family are broader and wasp-like, and include plasterer bees. Bees in the Halictidae family include many species of sweat bees, and most have shiny metallic colored or black bodies. Bees in the Megachilidae family include resin and mason bees, orchard bees, and leaf-cutter bees that mostly nest in holes. Most families of bees contain some types of parasitic and cuckoo<sup>16</sup> bees. For a summary of the different types of wild bees see the text box above.

<sup>13</sup> Iowa State University, “Native Bees of North America,” <http://bugguide.net/node/view/475348>.

<sup>14</sup> NRC, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007, p. 50; and Xerces Society, “Pollinator Conservation: Native Bee Biology,” <http://www.xerces.org/native-bees/>.

<sup>15</sup> NRC, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007, p. 43.

<sup>16</sup> Refers to bees that lay their eggs in another bee’s nest; as their eggs hatch early, the cuckoo larvae eat the other’s provisions.



## Importance of Bee Pollination

Worldwide, the contribution of bees and other insects to worldwide crop production for human food is valued at about \$190 billion each year.<sup>17</sup> In the United States alone, the value of insect pollination to U.S. agricultural production is estimated at \$16 billion annually, of which about three-fourths of the value is attributable to honey bees.<sup>18</sup>

Expressed somewhat differently, another widely cited estimate is that bee pollination of agricultural crops is said to account for about one-third of the U.S. diet, contributing to the production of a diverse range of high-value fruits, vegetables, tree nuts, forage crops, some field crops, and other specialty crops.<sup>19</sup>

Both managed and wild bees are critical to plant pollination and are economically valuable to U.S. agricultural production. Bee pollination of agricultural crops is said to contribute to the production of as many as 90 agricultural crops.<sup>20</sup> A number of agricultural crops are almost totally (90%-100%) dependent on animal pollination, including apples, avocados, blueberries, cranberries, cherries, kiwi fruit, macadamia nuts, asparagus, broccoli, carrots, cauliflower, celery, cucumbers, onions, legume seeds, pumpkins, squash, and sunflowers.<sup>21</sup> Other specialty crops also rely on pollination, but to a lesser degree.<sup>22</sup> USDA reports that native bees also provide pollination services for a number of food crops. In addition to some of the aforementioned crops, these include alfalfa seeds, almonds, canola, chokecherries, grapefruit, pears, plums, prunes, soybeans (hybrid seed production), tomatoes, vegetable seeds, and watermelons.<sup>23</sup> The role of bee pollination in enhancing agricultural productivity and crop yields for many types of fruit, vegetable, tree nut, and field crops was also noted in a series of published studies as part of the United Nations' Global Pollination Project.<sup>24</sup>

Native bees are thought to be more efficient at pollination than honey bees and are known to pollinate native plants, such as cherries, blueberries, and cranberries, as well as other commercial crops including almonds, among other fruiting and flowering plants.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>17</sup> N. Gallai et al., "Economic valuation of the vulnerability of world agriculture confronted with pollinator decline," *Ecological Economics*, 2009, 68: 810-821. Converted from the reported estimate of €153 billion (value in 2005).

<sup>18</sup> N. W. Calderone, "Insect Pollinated Crops, Insect Pollinators and US Agriculture: Trend Analysis of Aggregate Data for the Period 1992–2009," *PLoS ONE* 7(5): e37235, May 2012. Updated values are for 2010.

<sup>19</sup> M. R. Berenbaum, University of Illinois, statement before the Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, March 29, 2007; and J. Pettis, USDA's ARS, interview with University of Pennsylvania staff, January 23, 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Staple crops (wheat, corn, and rice) do not rely on insect pollination and are mostly wind-pollinated.

<sup>21</sup> R. A. Morse and N. W. Calderone, *The Value of Honey Bees as Pollinators of U.S. Crops in 2000*, March 2000, Cornell University; and A. M. Klein et al., "Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 274, No. 1608, February 7, 2007.

<sup>22</sup> Crops include apricot, citrus, peaches, pears, nectarines, plums, grapes, brambleberries, strawberries, olives, melon (cantaloupe, watermelon, and honeydew), peanuts, cotton, soybeans, and sugarbeets.

<sup>23</sup> USDA, "Agroforestry: Sustaining Native Bee Habitat Crop Pollination," AF note-32, August 2006.

<sup>24</sup> See February 2014 edition of *Journal of Pollination Ecology* ([www.pollinationecology.org](http://www.pollinationecology.org)). See also the UN's website (<http://www.internationalpollinatorsinitiative.org>).

<sup>25</sup> L.A. Garibaldi, et al., "Wild Pollinators Enhance Fruit Set of Crops Regardless of Honey Bee Abundance," *Science*, Volume 339: 1608-1611, March 29, 2013; H. Hamilton, "Buzz On Native Bees," USGS blog posting, June 17, 2013; and S. Milius, "Native Pollinators Boost Crop Yields Worldwide," *ScienceNews*, March 1, 2013.

## Estimated Economic Value

The economic value of pollination services provided by managed honey bees and wild bees is difficult to quantify. Most available estimates focus on crop pollination by managed honey bees. Data and information on native bees are more limited. Where few bee species are kept commercially and managed for their pollination services, wild bee species also play an important role in providing pollinator services to both commercial and small-scale home gardening systems. Both locally and globally, some are concerned that the availability of honey bee stocks is not keeping pace with growing agricultural demands for pollination services.<sup>26</sup>

Researchers at Cornell University estimate the monetary value to U.S. crops of total insect pollination—both commercial honey bees and other insect pollinators such as non-*Apis* bees and other insects—at about \$16.4 billion in 2010.<sup>27</sup> (**Table 1**) Of the estimated \$16.4 billion attributable to insect pollination in the United States, the value of pollination from honey bees is estimated at \$12.4 billion, or about three-fourths of the total value. The value of pollination from other insects, including non-*Apis* bees and other insects, is estimated at \$4.0 billion.<sup>28</sup>

Separate estimates of the economic value of only wild bee pollination services are not readily available. A 2011 study by researchers at the University of California estimated that wild bee species add \$0.9 billion to \$2.4 billion per year in value to California's agriculture through pollination services.<sup>29</sup> Some researchers estimate that native bees contribute up to 15% of the value of all pollination services to agricultural and native landscapes.<sup>30</sup> Additional efforts are underway in an attempt to estimate the value of pollination services of wild bees.

## Commercial Migratory Beekeeping

In the United States, most commercial pollination services are provided by migratory beekeepers that travel from state to state and provide pollination services to crop producers. These operations are able to supply a large number of bee colonies during the critical phase of a crop's bloom cycle, when honey bees pollinate a crop as they fly from flower to flower collecting nectar and pollen, which they carry back to the nest.<sup>31</sup> Of the roughly 2 million bee colonies rented out each year to pollinate U.S. agricultural crops, an estimated 1.6 million colonies are needed to pollinate California's more than 900,000 acres of almond trees alone.<sup>32</sup> Increasingly, bee colony rentals are also being used to pollinate cultivated blueberries in the East Coast states and in the Midwest.<sup>33</sup> Other information indicates that bee colonies are also rented for apple, pear, plum, cherry,

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, M. A. Aizen and L. D. Harder, "The Global Stock of Domesticated Honey Bees Is Growing Slower than Agricultural Demand for Pollination," *Current Biology*, May 2009.

<sup>27</sup> N. W. Calderone, "Insect Pollinated Crops, Insect Pollinators and US Agriculture: Trend Analysis of Aggregate Data for the Period 1992–2009," *PLoS ONE* 7(5): e37235, May 2012. Other available estimates for the total value of bee and insect pollination range from \$5.7 billion to \$19.0 billion annually (as reported by the NRC in 2007).

<sup>28</sup> Other known insect pollinators are wasps, hover flies, other flies, beetles, thrips, ants, butterflies, and moths.

<sup>29</sup> R. Chaplin-Kramer et al., "Value of Wildland Habitat for Supplying Pollination Services to Californian Agriculture," *Rangelands*, June 2011, Vol. 33(3): 33-41.

<sup>30</sup> A.V. Smith, "Where the Wild Bees Roam Native pollinators need more protection," *EugeneWeekly*, September 11, 2014. See also S. Rao and W. P. Stephen, "Abundance and Diversity of Native Bumble Bees Associated with Agricultural Crops: The Willamette Valley Experience," *Psyche*, Volume 2010, December 2009.


<sup>31</sup> Some "spillover" pollination occurs, including pollination from colonies owned by part-time beekeepers and hobbyists, or pollination of adjacent fields from commercial hives.

<sup>32</sup> Almond Board of California, <http://www.almonds.com/growers/pollination>.

<sup>33</sup> "Honey Bees and Blueberry Pollination," Fact Sheet 629, University of Maine Extension, April 2002.

cranberry, avocado, cucumber, kiwi fruit, melon, pepper, and citrus fruit production, as well as for alfalfa, clover seed, and sunflower production. (See map in **Figure 1**.) Overall, demand for pollination services is rising faster than available supplies, which are further exacerbated by declining managed and wild pollinator populations.<sup>34</sup>

**Figure 1. Map of Commercial Pollination**



**Source:** Posted at Person County (NC) Beekeepers Association by Inge Kautzmann, October 28, 2011. See also Penn State University, "A Year in the Life of a Migratory Honey Bee Colony"; M. Burgett, 1999 *Pacific Northwest Honey Bee Pollination Survey*, Oregon State University; and Pollination Map for Honey Bees in the United States.

Rental fees collected by commercial beekeepers for pollination services may vary by crop type, and tend to be lower for some seed crops and higher for berry and tree crops. In recent years, pollination fees paid by crop producers have increased. For example, fees paid by California's almond industry have risen from a reported \$35 per colony in the late 1990s to about \$75 per colony in 2005. More recent estimates of fees for pollinating almond trees are even higher, at \$150 per colony or more (**Figure 2**).<sup>35</sup> Fees may also vary by region.

**Table 1. Estimated Value of Insect Pollination to U.S. Crop Production, 2010**

Crop Category	Dependence on Insect Pollination	Proportion of Pollinators That Are Honey bees	Value Attributed to All Insect Pollinators (\$ millions)	Portion Attributed to Honey bees (\$ millions)	Major Producing States
Grain and seed crops	10%-100%	20%-90%	826.9	744.2	CA, ND, SD, ID, WI
Peanuts	10%	50%	90.1	18.0	GA, FL, AL, TX, NC
Cotton (seed)	20%	80%	200.8	160.6	TX, AR, GA, MS

<sup>34</sup> T.D. Breeze, et al., "Agricultural Practices Exacerbate Honeybee Pollination Service Supply-Demand Mismatches Across Europe," *PLoS ONE* 9(1): e82996, January 2014.

<sup>35</sup> D. M. Caron, R. Sagili, and M. Cooper, "Pacific Northwest (PNW) 2011 Beekeeper Pollination."

<b>Apples</b>	100%	90%	2,220.8	1,998.7	WA, NY, MI, PA
<b>Peaches, nectarines</b>	60%	80%	446.4	357.1	CA, SC, GA, PA, WA
<b>Prunes, plums</b>	70%	90%	163.2	146.9	CA, ID, MI, OR, WA
<b>Cherries</b>	90%	90%	685.5	617.0	WA, CA, OR, MI
<b>Other fruit (incl. olives)</b>	10%-90%	10%-90%	656.3	578.3	CA, FL, WA
<b>Almonds</b>	100%	100%	2,838.5	2,838.5	CA
<b>Macadamia nuts</b>	90%	90%	27.0	24.3	HI
<b>Blueberries</b>	100%	90%	644.0	579.6	ME, MI, GA, OR, WA, NJ
<b>Strawberries</b>	20%	10%	449.1	44.9	CA, FL, OR
<b>Other berries</b>	80%-100%	90%	551.7	496.5	WA, CA, OR
<b>Oranges</b>	30%	90%	580.5	522.4	CA, FL, AZ, TX
<b>Grapefruit</b>	80%	90%	228.8	205.9	FL, CA, AZ, TX
<b>Lemons</b>	20%	10%	76.1	7.6	CA, AZ
<b>Tangerines, tangelos</b>	40%-50%	90%	140.8	126.7	CA, FL
<b>Soybeans</b>	10%	50%	3,891.5	1,945.8	IA, IL, MN, IN
<b>Cantaloupes</b>	80%	90%	251.5	226.4	CA, AZ, GA, CO, IN, PA
<b>Cucumbers</b>	90%	90%	340.4	306.3	FL, GA, NC, CA, NY, MI
<b>Squash</b>	90%	10%	183.2	18.3	FL, NY, CA, NC
<b>Other melons, pumpkins</b>	70%-90%	10%-90%	489.0	356.2	IL, CA, NY, OH, PA, MI
<b>Grapes</b>	10%	10%	362.7	36.3	CA, OR, WA, VA
<b>TOTAL</b>	—	—	<b>\$16,345</b>	<b>\$12,357</b>	—


**Source:** Compiled by CRS using values reported in N. W. Calderone, "Insect Pollinated Crops, Insect Pollinators and US Agriculture: Trend Analysis of Aggregate Data for the Period 1992–2009," *PLoS ONE* 7(5): e37235, May 2012, <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0037235>. Supporting documentation provides data for individual crops from 1992 through 2009, with an update for 2010. Updates previous estimates by R. A. Morse and N. W. Calderone, *The Value of Honey Bees as Pollinators of U.S. Crops in 2000*, Cornell University, March 2000.

**Notes:** Value of crop production attributable to insect pollinators, including honey bees, is expressed in terms of the plant's dependence on pollination, and the insect's contribution to increased yield and quality achieved from pollination, including the indirect benefits of insect pollination required for seed production of some crops.

Among the reasons for higher pollination fees are expanding almond acreage and relatively high honey prices, but also fewer available honey bees for pollination due, in part, to colony declines and bee mortalities. In 2009, across a range of commodities (excluding almonds), average rental fees for pollination services ranged from \$39 per colony to \$70 per colony.<sup>36</sup>

Precise statistics are not available on the number of commercial migratory beekeepers. In the United States, it is generally believed that operations with the majority of bee colonies—more than 2 million of the roughly 3 million bee colonies in the United States—belong to commercial migratory beekeepers, mostly in the Dakotas and in some midwestern states.

**Figure 2. Weighted Pollination Fee, by Major Sector, Northwest, 2000-2011**  
(total rental value divided by number of rental colonies [\$/colony])



**Source:** D. M. Caron, R. Sagili, and M. Cooper, "Pacific Northwest (PNW) 2011 Beekeeper Pollination."

**Notes:** "Weighted fee" = total rental value divided by number of rental colonies. Data for Eastern U.S. states are at D. M. Caron, "Bee Colony Pollination Rental Prices, Eastern U.S. with Comparison to West Coast," 2011.

## Changes in Bee Populations

### Managed Honey Bees

USDA does not compile comprehensive annual survey data on honey bee colonies. Available data are limited and not ideal for evaluating population changes among honey bees. Annual data on the number of honey bee colonies are from statistics tracking the number of operations that produce honey for commercial sale. Additional data on all "colonies of bees" are from USDA's five-year *Census of Agriculture* (the most recent available data are for 2012). In response to concerns about honey bee declines, USDA and the national bee laboratories have started to survey beekeepers each year regarding overwinter colony losses as part of the "Bee Informed Partnership."

Available USDA data on the number of bee colonies in honey production are not strictly comparable. Data are compiled for different purposes—the *Census* data track all farms with bee colonies, the annual honey production data track operations that produce honey for commercial

<sup>36</sup> D. M. Caron, "Bee Colony Pollination Rental Prices, Eastern U.S. with Comparison to West Coast" (Table 1, Crop Pollination in MAAREC Region (PA, DE, NJ, MD, VA, WV) and CA, 2008-2009), 2011.

sale. Data are also compiled using different data collection techniques—one is a periodic census, the other a statistical estimate. Generally, USDA data are mostly intended to track the number of honey-producing colonies; however, it is the value of managed bees as crop pollinators that provides the greatest economic impact in the production of food and feed crops.

A 2007 study by the National Research Council (NRC) voiced concerns about the available USDA data on honey bees, cautioning against use of these data to determine changes in honey bee populations.<sup>37</sup> Concerns about the data include the following: the data track U.S. honey production rather than bee populations; the lack of comparability among the available data compilations; the potential for misidentification of species and miscounting because of data collection procedures; and other issues.

Notwithstanding these concerns about data availability and quality, the NRC study concluded: “Long-term population trends for the honey bee, the most important managed pollinator, are demonstrably downward.”<sup>38</sup> Honey bee colony losses are not uncommon. The NRC study cites USDA data showing honey bee declines in 1947–1972 and 1989–1996, as well as declines starting in 2005 (despite reports of a sharp rise in 2010).

## U.S. Farms with Bee Colonies

Data from the most recent USDA *Census of Agriculture* indicate that there were 3.3 million bee colonies on U.S. farms in 2012.<sup>39</sup> These data are based on the reported 38,300 farms with honey production during that year. This compares to previous *Census* data from 2007, when there were 28,000 operations with 2.9 million bee colonies in the United States, reflecting the recent increased interest in beekeeping. Available limited historical data indicate that there were an estimated 6 million honey bee colonies on U.S. farms during the 1950s.<sup>40</sup> These overall trends may reflect ongoing consolidation and structural shifts in the U.S. agricultural sectors, rather than conclusive trends in species populations, abundance, and distribution.

By state, about one-third of all bee colonies are located in California, with another roughly one-third located in North and South Dakota, Florida, Texas, and Montana. Other states include Washington, Oregon, Michigan, New York, Georgia, Arizona, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Wyoming. Although these operations also produce honey for commercial sale, their value as crop pollinators provides the greatest economic impact in the production of food and feed crops.

## Honey-Producing Bee Colonies

USDA annual data for honey-producing colonies are similarly inconclusive. These data show year-to-year fluctuations, but not a clear downward trend over time.

Over the 10-year period shown, the number of honey-producing bee colonies dropped from 2.6 million bee colonies in 2002–2003 to lows of 2.3 million to 2.4 million bee colonies in 2006–2008. In 2010, the sector reached a 10-year high when honey production increased and the number of honey bee colonies totaled nearly 2.7 million (**Table 2**).

This increase in the number of honey-producing hives may reflect efforts among beekeepers to continually replenish their hives—either in response to a colony die-off or to increase the number

---

<sup>37</sup> NRC, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007, p. 3.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> USDA, *2012 Census of Agriculture*, Table 21 (state-level data). Honey sales were valued at \$264 million in 2012.

<sup>40</sup> Presentation to Congressional staff by Jeff Pettis, USDA/Agricultural Research Service, June 18, 2012.



of hives to raise overall honey production or to provide additional pollinator services. This increase might also reflect the rising popularity of beekeeping as a part-time hobby.

Overall, these data illustrate that despite a greater number of honey-producing colonies, annual honey production remains lower compared to just a decade ago.

Measured by overall honey production in 2013, states producing the most honey in the United States include North Dakota (22%), South Dakota (10%), Montana (10%), Florida (9%), California (7%), and Minnesota (5%).<sup>41</sup> Other major honey-producing states are Idaho, Texas, Michigan, Oregon, Georgia, Nebraska, New York, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

**Table 2. Honey-Producing Bee Colonies, 2002-2013**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Honey-Producing Colonies (1,000 colonies)</b>	<b>Honey Production (1,000 pounds)</b>
<b>2002</b>	2,574	171,718
<b>2003</b>	2,599	181,727
<b>2004</b>	2,556	183,582
<b>2005</b>	2,413	174,818
<b>2006</b>	2,393	154,907
<b>2007</b>	2,443	148,341
<b>2008</b>	2,342	163,789
<b>2009</b>	2,498	146,416
<b>2010</b>	2,692	176,462
<b>2011</b>	2,491	148,357
<b>2012</b>	2,539	142,296
<b>2013</b>	2,640	149,499

**Source:** USDA, *Honey*, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/MannUsda/viewDocumentInfo.do?documentID=1191>. Honey production from producers with five or more colonies. Honey producing colonies are the maximum number of colonies from which honey was taken during the year, although it is possible to take honey from colonies that did not survive the entire year.

## Annual “Winter Loss” Survey

Heightened attention about CCD has resulted in better tracking of annual honey bee colony losses by USDA and national bee laboratories. This effort has evolved into the collection of an annual winter loss survey, conducted by the Bee Informed Partnership<sup>42</sup> and the Apiary Inspectors of America (AIA), along with leading research labs and universities in agriculture and science, and is supported by USDA and its research agency, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA).<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> USDA, *Honey*, March 2014, <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/current/Hone/Hone-03-21-2014.pdf>.

<sup>42</sup> The Bee Informed Partnership is an extension project that seeks to decrease the number of honey bee colonies that die over the winter, in part through the creation of the so-called Bee Informed Database of honey bee health. This database will contain data collected by the Bee Informed Partnership survey efforts, as well as data from other honey bee health monitoring projects. Funding for the survey is from the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative of USDA’s National Institute of Food and Agriculture. For more information, see <http://beeinformed.org/about/bip-database/>.

<sup>43</sup> For more information, see the Bee Informed Partnership website: <http://beeinformed.org/>.

USDA reports that bee colony losses averaged 17%-20% per year between the 1990s and mid-2000s, attributable to a variety of factors, such as mites, diseases, and management stress.<sup>44</sup> By comparison, bee colony losses between the winters of 2006/2007 and 2013/2014 have averaged nearly 30% annually (**Figure 3**). Reported annual loss rates of managed honey bee colonies from all causes nationwide are as follows:<sup>45</sup>

- 23% in the winter of 2013/2014;
- 31% in the winter of 2012/2013;
- 22% in the winter of 2011/2012;
- 30% in the winter of 2010/2011;
- 34% in the winter of 2009/2010;
- 29% in the winter of 2008/2009;
- 36% in the winter of 2007/2008;
- 32% in the winter of 2006/2007.

Other information from USDA's 2012/2013 annual survey indicates that 70% of responding beekeepers reported losses greater than 14%—the level of loss that beekeepers say allow them to remain economically viable as a business.<sup>46</sup>

The first survey in this series was conducted by the AIA, covering the winter of 2006/2007.<sup>47</sup> Of the responding beekeepers, about one-fourth reported conditions associated with CCD.<sup>48</sup> The survey indicated that, among the beekeepers surveyed, more than 50% reported “abnormally heavy losses” with total colony losses of 55%. This compared to those reporting “normal losses” with total colony losses of 16%. Beekeeping operations experiencing CCD-like conditions reported losses of 45% of their managed bee colonies. Among the leading causes reported by most affected commercial beekeeping operations were pest diseases.

<sup>44</sup> Pollinator Partnership, “Helping the earth by supporting pollinators,” 2009 publication. Estimates attributed to Jeffrey S. Pettis at USDA's Agricultural Research Service (ARS).


<sup>45</sup> D. vanEngelsdorp et al., “Colony Loss 2013-2014,” May 15, 2014, <http://beeinformed.org/2014/05/colony-loss-2013-2014/>. Past surveys are all posted on the Bee Informed Partnership website. To maintain a strong, healthy colony that will winter well and keep a large bee population through the following spring, the colony needs to rear a large number of bees capable of overwintering.

<sup>46</sup> K. Kaplan, “Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses during Winter of 2012/2013,” May 2013.

<sup>47</sup> D. vanEngelsdorp, R. Underwood, D. Caron, and J. Hayes Jr., “An Estimate of Managed Colony Losses in the Winter of 2006-2007: A Report Commissioned by the Apiary Inspectors of America,” *American Bee Journal*, July 2007. Based on a survey of beekeepers that included 384 respondents representing 153,000 managed bee colonies located in AR, FL, GA, MD, MI, MS, MT, NM, ND, OH, PA, SD, TN, and WI.

<sup>48</sup> These statistics may have been misrepresented in the popular press, which often state that 25% of the nation's 2.4 million colonies have been lost (citing the AIA survey as its source).



**Figure 3. Managed Honey Bee Colony Losses in the United States**

**Source:** D. vanEngelsdorp et al., “Colony Loss 2013-2014,” May 15, 2014. Summary of total overwinter colony loss (October 1 – April 1) of managed honey bee colonies in the United States across the 8 annual national surveys (red bars). The acceptable range (blue bars) is the average percentage of acceptable loss declared by the survey participants in each of the eight years of the survey.

Subsequent survey results indicate that the number of managed honey bee colonies again dropped in each of the following winters. One exception was overwinter 2011/2012, when surveyed total losses of colonies from all causes were 22% nationwide and represented a substantial improvement in mortality compared to the previous five years. The following year (2012/2013), however, total losses of managed honey bee colonies nationwide again reached more than 30% from all causes. Estimated losses in overwinter 2013/2014 dropped back again to 23%.

Based on the annual winter loss surveys, USDA estimates that overwinter colony losses have averaged more than 30% annually since 2006/2007. However, bee colonies have continued to “dwindle away” each year for reasons not solely attributable to CCD, which is characterized by colony populations that are suddenly lost.<sup>49</sup> USDA claims that “beekeepers did not report CCD as a major cause of colony loss” of overwinter losses in both the 2012-2013 and the 2011/2012 surveys. Whether colony losses are attributable to CCD may be based, in part, on reported colony losses “with no dead bees present, which is indicative of CCD.”<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> K. Kaplan, “Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses during Winter of 2012/2013,” May 2013, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/beelosses/index.htm>.

<sup>50</sup> USDA, *CCD Progress Report*, June 2012, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccdprogressreport2012.pdf>, p. 9.

## Wild Bee Species

While managed bees are commercially important, wild bee species are important ecologically for sustainable forests and fields. However, no comprehensive formal statistics are available on populations of wild bees in the United States.

Of the estimated 3,500 species of solitary bees, none are thoroughly surveyed. Scientific literature is replete with assertions about the paucity of data on one group or another of native bees. Long-term data are particularly difficult to obtain for wild bees. As concluded by the researchers in a 2007 National Research Council (NRC) study, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, among all wild pollinators:

There is evidence of decline in the abundance of some pollinators, but the strength of this evidence varies among taxa. Long-term population trends for several wild bee species (notably bumble bees) ... are notably downward. For most pollinator species, however, the paucity of long-term population data and the incomplete knowledge of even basic taxonomy and ecology make definitive assessment of status exceedingly difficult.<sup>51</sup>

In the absence of comprehensive data, as some of the studies cited below demonstrate, scientists seeking to find any data to analyze broad pollinator trends might be forced to rely on amalgamations of disparate studies, collections by citizen scientists,<sup>52</sup> and other unconventional approaches. Studies, however, show that populations of native wild pollinators are declining.<sup>53</sup>

### “Citizen Science” Surveys of Status

As various studies demonstrate, there have been numerous attempts to promote the use of various informal “citizen science” initiatives in California, Florida, other East Coast states, and elsewhere.<sup>54</sup> For example, compared to most native species, bumble bees (*Bombus*) are better studied. In part this is attributable to studies which recruit citizens to gather data—for example, forming Bumble Bee Brigades in one campaign.<sup>55</sup> Even so, information about wild bumble bees is not comprehensive.

In 2010, an international group of scientists reviewed global trends in pollinator species, including bees.<sup>56</sup> They cited a study based on data gathered by citizen-scientists in the United Kingdom and in the Netherlands (number of years of observation varying by location) showing that “in both countries, bee diversity has fallen significantly in most landscapes.... Analysis of pollinator traits demonstrated that in bees ..., specialist (diet and/or habitat) and sedentary species tended to decline, whereas mobile generalists tended to thrive.” As the study notes, although the

<sup>51</sup> For more information, see CRS Report RL31654, *The Endangered Species Act: A Primer*.

<sup>52</sup> A well-known example of citizen-scientist-based data in North America is the annual Christmas bird count, which has been conducted for nearly a century in some areas. Data may not serve for some quantitative analyses, but may be much more reliable for the presence or absence of a bird, for example. In other studies, on arrival dates at bird feeders, or bees on spring flowers, the date on which a species is first observed could be another relatively reliable observation.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, L.A. Burke, et al., “Plant-Pollinator Interaction over 120 Years: Loss of Species, Co-Occurrence, and Function,” *Science*, Volume 339: 1611-1615, March 29, 2013.

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, the University of California’s backyard bee count (<http://www.greatsunflower.org/>), the University of Florida’s “Native Buzz” project (<http://www.ufnativebuzz.com/>), and the “Bee Hunt” project organized by multiple university staff, federal agencies, and private partnerships (<http://www.discoverlife.org/bee/index.html>).

<sup>55</sup> The University of Wyoming, through its Berry Center, sponsors the program. See <http://www.uwyo.edu/berrycenter/citizen-science/bumblebees.html> for more information.

<sup>56</sup> S. G. Potts, J. C. Biesmeijer, C. Kremen et al., 2010, “Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers,” *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, v. 25, n. 6, pp. 345-353.

“dynamics between plants and their pollinators suggest a link between the two,” this is correlative and the mechanism is still not known: “It could be that plant declines are caused, in part, by a lack of pollination services, or bees could be declining owing to a lack of floral resources” or both could be declining due to “shared sensitivity to environmental changes.”<sup>57</sup>

Another North American study examined both museum collection records and intensive nationwide surveys for records of abundance and distribution of eight bumble bee species.<sup>58</sup> The study showed that four species of bumble bees have declined in relative abundance by up to 96%. These four species also contracted their ranges by 23% to 87%. These changes were statistically highly significant; the other four species examined showed no clear pattern in terms of range reduction. The study hypothesized that the four declining species may be affected by a pathogen (*Nosema bombi*) as well as reduced genetic diversity.<sup>59</sup> The data were adequate only to show an association, rather than a cause—were the four species declining because of the disease and low genetic diversity? Or was some other factor causing these species to decline and making them more susceptible to the disease and also reducing their genetic diversity?

### Import and Release of Non-*Apis* Pollinating Insects

For years, conservation groups such as the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), and Defenders of Wildlife have petitioned USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to regulate the movement of commercial bumble bees in response to concerns about population declines.<sup>60</sup> These groups contend that pathogens transmitted by commercial bumble bees are contributing to the spread of parasites and pathogens among wild bumble bees. Commercially reared and imported bumblebees are imported for pollination of greenhouse crops, such as tomatoes. A 2013 study by researchers in Europe showed that about 75% of bumble bee colonies imported into the United Kingdom each year are infected with parasites, and may pose risks to wild bees and honey bees.<sup>61</sup> The North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) has published guidelines intended to assist in preparing a petition for the importation and release of non-*Apis* pollinating insects, and to assist reviewers and regulators in assessing the risk associated with their importation, movement and release.<sup>62</sup>

### Endangered Species Act (ESA) Information

Another source of information about potential population changes among wild bee species includes listings under the Endangered Species Act (ESA, P.L. 93-205, 87 Stat. 884. 16 U.S.C. §§1531-1544). An ESA determination will include an analysis of the threats to a species, its

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> S. A. Cameron, J. D. Lozier, J. P. Strange et al., 2011, “Patterns of widespread decline in North American bumble bees,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, v. 108, n. 2, pp. 662-667.

<sup>59</sup> The study notes that some believe *Nosema bombi* was introduced via commercially imported European bumble bees, and North American bumble bees may therefore have less resistance to the disease than European species.

<sup>60</sup> Xerces press release, “Protection for Pollinators: Conservation Groups and Scientists Push USDA to Save Wild Bumble Bees,” October 29, 2013. See also North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC), *Importation of Non-Native Bumble Bees into North America: Potential Consequences of Using Bombus terrestris and Other Non-Native Bumble Bees for Greenhouse Crop Pollination in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*, August 2006.

<sup>61</sup> P. Graystock et al., “The Trojan hives: pollinator pathogens, imported and distributed in bumblebee colonies,” *Journal of Applied Ecology*, Volume 50, Issue 5: 1207–1215, October 2013.

<sup>62</sup> NAPPO, “Guidelines for the Petition for Import and Release of Non-*Apis* Pollinating Insects into NAPPO Countries,” NAPPO Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) No. 29, October 2008.

current status and range, and other factors essential to its conservation.<sup>63</sup> For example, one bumble bee species (*B. franklini*) is thought to be extinct in its very limited (former) range in northeastern California and southeastern Oregon. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has this species under review for listing.<sup>64</sup> In addition, FWS has proposed seven species of yellow-faced bees (Genus *Hylaeus* in the Family Colletidae) for listing under ESA, with high priority for listing (2 on a scale of 12).<sup>65</sup> All members of this genus, including these seven, are found only in Hawaii.

In May 2013, the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) filed a complaint against the Department of the Interior and FWS, requesting action on a petition to grant ESA protection to the rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*). The petitioners claim this bee was “previously common across the Upper Midwest and Eastern Seaboard, but in recent years it has been lost from 87% of its historic range.” They also claim the bee is an important pollinator of prairie wildflowers, but also of cranberries, blueberries, apples, alfalfa, and other crops.<sup>66</sup>

## Interactions with Physical Environment

Studies have showed that phenological changes<sup>67</sup> in flowering times are accompanied by changes in the spring emergence of bee populations. Such studies on flowering times and pollination found that 10 species of bees (including both solitary and social species) had advanced to earlier dates in the spring for their first emergence, and the flowering times of the plants they visited also advanced.<sup>68</sup> Advances in emergence time over the period from 1970-2010 were highly significant. The data “[support] the idea that climate change is the main factor explaining the observed phenological advances.” However, the study concludes that “phenological mismatch probably has not occurred already, but that it could occur in the future, as rates of temperature warming increase.” At the same time, the study noted that it analyzed generalist bees and generalist flowers—bees that visit many plant species, and plants visited by many bee species.<sup>69</sup> Where the life cycles of particular bee species are tied to particular plant species, different trends may occur. While no data were reported on the population sizes of these bees, the study showed no clear connection between climate change (as measured by flowering times) and any harm to the species studied. The bees seemed to be keeping up with the changes in dates of flower availability.

The phenomenon known as *trophic cascade* may also play a role in the interaction of pollinator species. Many plants can be pollinated by more than one species, and many bee species use more than one pollen or nectar source. As individual pollinator species (bees or other species) decline, other species may take over the declining species’ role. Where the data are available, evidence suggests that, where a generalist bee species is able to step in to provide pollination services

<sup>63</sup> NRC, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2007, p. 7. See also p. 88 (referring to *Bombus*, or bumble bees); p. 29 (referring to pollinators generally in North America); and p. 203 (referring to the absence of baseline data on pollinator status generally as an impediment to estimation of any decline).

<sup>64</sup> See FWS, “Species Profile,” <http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=I0IR>.

<sup>65</sup> See FWS, “Endangered Species,” <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/>.

<sup>66</sup> Xerces press release, “Rusty Patched Bumble Bee Threatened with Extinction,” May 13, 2014. The complaint is available at <http://www.xerces.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Bee-Case-Complaint-as-filed.pdf>.

<sup>67</sup> *Phenology* refers to the scientific study of biological phenomena that are cyclical or periodic. Examples include migration, hibernation, and nesting, as well as flowering times, and is important in analysis of climate change.

<sup>68</sup> See, for example, I. Bartomeus, et al., 2011, “Climate-associated phenological advances in bee pollinators and bee-pollinated plants,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, v. 108, n. 51, pp. 20645-20649.

<sup>69</sup> Across four genera: *Andrena* (three species), *Bombus* (two species), *Colletes* (one species), and *Osmia* (four species).

(even if less able than a specialist bee), the effects of a reduced bee population may be masked by the generalist. In more concrete terms, the presence of a highly efficient generalist—like the honey bee—may mask the loss of native species (regardless of the reason for the decline of the native species). If honey bees themselves then decline, the effects of the lost population may be more severe because populations of back-up pollinators have already been reduced or eliminated. And conversely, reductions in honey bee populations may reduce competition sufficiently to allow other (reduced) bee populations to rebound to greater numbers.

Another study examined population changes in meliponine (or stingless) bees. Previously stingless bees were widely cultivated by Native Americans in Central and South America before the introduction of honey bees from Europe. However, loss of forest cover eliminates nesting sites; also the shift by beekeepers to honey bees for more intensive production has also reduced the number of stingless bees. An analysis of the effects of forestry on stingless bees in Brazil observed that most bee nests were found in hollow trees over 50 cm (~20 inches) in diameter.<sup>70</sup> Given the high value of the bees as pollinators for many species of plants, and the low commercial value of hollow trees, the study recommended that managed forests maintain hollow trees as both seed sources and as homes for these bees. Some studies suggest that stingless bees are especially susceptible to some pesticides.<sup>71</sup>

## Factors Affecting Bee Health

Among the factors that are thought to be harming bee health are (listed in no particular order):

- **parasites, pathogens, and diseases**<sup>72</sup> (for a detailed listing, see text box);
- **bee genetics** including lack of genetic diversity and lineage of bees, and increased susceptibility and lowered disease resistance;
- **miticide resistance**;<sup>73</sup>
- **diet and nutrition** including poor nutrition due to apiary overcrowding, pollination of crops with low nutritional value, and pollen or nectar scarcity associated with invasive plants;
- **bee management issues** including transportation stress from migratory beekeeping, overcrowding, feeding practices, chemicals used by beekeepers to control mites (antibiotics and miticides), confinement and temperature fluctuations, susceptibility to disease, potential for cumulative exposure to diseases and parasites, use of bees for honey production versus pollination, chemical residue or contamination in the wax, and reliability of the queen source;
- **habitat loss, and other environmental or biological stressors** including loss of foraging area, interspecific competition between honey bees and native bees, pathogen spillover effects, and climate change;

<sup>70</sup> G. C. Venturieri, 2009, “The impact of forest exploitation on Amazonian stingless bees (Apidae Meliponini),” *Genetics and Molecular Research*, v. 8, n. 2, pp. 684-689.

<sup>71</sup> H. V. V. Tomé, G. F. Martins et al., 2012, “Imidacloprid-induced impairment of mushroom bodies and behavior of the native stingless bee *Melipona quadrifasciata anthidioides*,” *PLoS ONE*, v. 7, n. 6, p. e38406.

<sup>72</sup> Among the leading causes of declining bee populations cited in the 2007 NRC study—which was published before CCD became a well-publicized phenomenon—were pathogens and introduced parasites, particularly *Varroa destructor*, the varroa mite. That study, among others, documents the extensive, but still inconclusive literature on honey bee population losses due to bee pests, parasites, pathogens, and disease, as well as other causes.

<sup>73</sup> A miticide is a pesticide intended to kill mites.

- **pesticides** including acute or cumulative exposure to new types or combinations of agricultural pesticides through a variety of media including dust, water droplets, pollen, and nectar;
- **other agricultural practices** including the use of genetically incorporated pesticides in seeds or treated seeds, such as with bioengineered crops; and
- **potential cumulative and interactive effects** of each of these factors.

Many of these factors were among those initially thought to be contributing to CCD.<sup>74</sup> As outlined in USDA's 2011 progress report, the available research over the past years has led USDA and university researchers to conclude that "no single factor or specific combination of factors has been identified" as a 'cause' for CCD.<sup>75</sup> This has led researchers to consider CCD may be "a syndrome caused by many different factors, working in combination or synergistically";<sup>76</sup> it may also involve "an interaction between pathogens and other stress factors."<sup>77</sup>

According to USDA: "Despite a number of claims in the general and scientific media, a cause or causes of CCD have not been identified by researchers."<sup>78</sup> However, CCD may not be the single leading cause of honey bee colony losses in recent years.<sup>79</sup> USDA reports that in 2012/2013, "there were more colonies that dwindled away" rather than suffering from the onset of CCD, which is characterized by a sudden loss in bee colony populations. Whether colony loss is attributable to CCD may also be based, in part, on reported colony losses "with no dead bees present, which is indicative of CCD" (i.e., the absence of dead bees).<sup>80</sup> USDA also claims that "beekeepers did not report CCD as a major cause" of overwinter losses in its 2012-2013 and 2011-2012 surveys.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> For more information, see CRS Report RL33938, *Honey Bee Colony Collapse Disorder*.

<sup>75</sup> USDA, *CCD Progress Report*, June 2011, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccdprogressreport2011.pdf>.

<sup>76</sup> USDA, *CCD Progress Report*, June 2009, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccdprogressreport.pdf>.

<sup>77</sup> D. vanEngelsdorp et al., 2009, "Colony collapse disorder: A descriptive study," *PLOS One*, v. 4, n. 8, (August).

<sup>78</sup> USDA, "Honey Bees and Colony Collapse Disorder," <http://www.ars.usda.gov/News/docs.htm?docid=15572>.

<sup>79</sup> K. Kaplan, "Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses During Winter of 2012/2013."

<sup>80</sup> USDA, *CCD Progress Report*, June 2012, <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccdprogressreport2012.pdf>, p. 9.

<sup>81</sup> K. Kaplan, "Fact Sheet: Survey of Bee Losses During Winter of 2012/2013."



### Pests and Diseases Affecting Honey Bees

As noted in the 2007 NRC study, among the leading causes of managed honey bee losses are diseases, parasites, and recently introduced competitors. Most notable are declines due to two parasitic mites, the so-called vampire mite (*Varroa destructor*) and the tracheal mite (*Acarapis woodi*). Also of concern is the emergence of new or newly virulent fungal and viral diseases. New invasive pests are also harming bees.

Below is a listing of some identified pests and diseases. For more information, see the 2007 NRC study, *Status of Pollinators in North America*. The following is excerpted mainly from *The Beekeepers Handbook*.

**Honey bee diseases** may be caused by a protozoan (e.g., bacteria or amoeba), fungus, or virus.

- **Nosema disease** is the most common adult bee disease, and is caused by a microscopic fungus (formerly considered to be a protozoan). Two *Nosema* species are found in honey bees: (1) *Nosema apis*; and (2) *Nosema ceranae* (the more virulent of the two).
- **American foulbrood disease (AFD)** is the most destructive of brood diseases. (Brood refers to the egg, larval, and pupal stages in bee development.) AFD is caused by a bacterium (*Paenibacillus larvae*) that occurs in a spore or a vegetative stage; the disease is transmitted by the spore and the infected brood is killed by the vegetative stage.
- **European foulbrood disease (EFD)** is also caused by a bacterium (*Melissococcus plutonius*) and is commonly found in colonies already weakened by lack of food or by other stressors.
- **Chalkbrood disease** is caused by a fungus (*Ascophaera apis*); adult bees can detect and remove diseased larvae; honey production may be reduced but the disease usually will not destroy a colony.
- **Amoeba disease** is caused by the amoeba *Malpighamoeba mellificae* Prell; it infests the gut of honey bees. Resistant spores (cysts) form in honey bees and can transmit the disease to other bees.
- Other less common adult diseases include **septicemia** and **spiroplasma**. Both are caused by bacteria. The former cause destruction of connective tissues; the latter infects the bees' blood. They tend to cause dysentery, and arise primarily from poor food and long periods of confinement.
- Some common **viral diseases** affecting honey bees include deformed wing virus (DWV); black queen cell virus (BQCV); Israeli acute paralysis virus (IAPV); acute bee paralysis virus (ABPV); sacbrood virus (SBV); Kashmir bee virus; and chronic bee paralysis virus (CBPV).

**Other pests** are mostly invertebrates, but some vertebrates are problematic locally. Among these pests are parasitic mites, insects, and some larger animals.

- **Tracheal mites** (*Acarapis woodi*) are parasitic mites that live inside the breathing organs of adult bees, and eventually a newly mated female mite emerges from the old host bee.
- **Varroa mites**, now known mostly for the vampire mite (*Varroa destructor*), are large mites that feed on infested bees, resulting in disfigured, stunted adult bees and deformed larvae and pupae (varroosis).
- Emerging threats such as the parasitic **phorid fly** (*Apocephalus borealis*), known to parasitize bumble bees, have been found to also parasitize honey bees and can eventually cause bees to abandon their hives.
- **Major insect enemies** include the wax moth and the small hive beetle.
- **Minor insect enemies** include assassin and ambush bugs, robber flies, mantids, wasps, and dragonflies.
- Various **vertebrate pests** include skunks, raccoons, bears, and mice.

One **competitor** deserves mention—the introduced Africanized honey bee. This bee is also a honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) but of a different strain from those imported from Europe. They are good foragers, but the colonies are more difficult to manage than the domestic European bee; they are sometimes called “killer bees,” although an individual bee’s sting is no more severe than that of a European bee. They were accidentally released in Brazil decades ago and have spread into the southern United States.

**Sources:** D. Sammataro and A. Avitabile, *The Beekeepers Handbook*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 189-232; Beekeepers Association of Northern Virginia, “Diseases, Parasites, Pests, and Predators,” presentation materials; and, for phorid flies, A. Core et al., “A New Threat to Honey Bees, the Parasitic Phorid Fly *Apocephalus borealis*,” *PLoS ONE* 7(1), January 3, 2012.

Honey bee colony losses are not uncommon. The NRC study documents the extensive literature on honey bee population losses due to bee pests, parasites, pathogens, and disease.<sup>82</sup> Most notable are declines due to two parasitic mites, the so-called vampire mite (*Varroa destructor*) and the tracheal mite (*Acarapis woodi*), and also colony declines due to the pathogen *Paenibacillus larvae*. Other reasons for bee colony declines reported by the NRC include interspecific competition between native and introduced bees, pathogen spillover effects, habitat loss, invasive plant species that reduce nectar- and pollen-producing vegetation, bee genetics, and pesticides, among other factors.

Mite infestations are a relatively new occurrence. The 1980s saw two periods of large die-offs due to *Varroa* and tracheal mites: The first *Varroa* mite infestation was reported in 1987; tracheal mites were first detected in 1984.<sup>83</sup> *Varroa* mites are also said to have eliminated most feral bee colonies in the mid-1990s. *Varroa* parasitism affects both worker bees and male larvae and can affect the ability of the queen to reproduce. It is associated with viral pathogens and if left untreated can cause colony mortalities usually within six months to two years after the initial infestation. Less is known about the effects of the tracheal mite. The pathogen *Paenibacillus larvae* is the most serious honey bee pathogen and causes American foulbrood (AFB), which is a disease of larval honey bees. AFB resulted in large colony losses in the 1940s, but its incidence has been reduced by the use of antibiotics and increased apiary inspection programs. Nevertheless, mite and pathogen infestations have likely raised beekeeper operating costs to pay for miticides and/or antibiotics, labor and expenses for treatment, improved management and inspection, and colony replacement of dead bees.

According to USDA, the cost of mite controls and hive replacement every 1-2 years, as opposed to every 3-5 years previously, calls into question whether beekeeping on the United States will continue to be financially viable.<sup>84</sup>

Symptoms similar to those observed for CCD have also been described in the past, and heavy losses have been documented. It is still not clear whether the current colony losses are being caused by the same factors or if new contributing factors are involved. Previously, similar conditions have been termed autumn collapse, May disease, spring dwindle, disappearing disease, and fall dwindle disease.

## Identified Future Needs

### National Pollinator Health Strategy (“Presidential Memorandum”)

In June 2014, the Obama Administration issued a Presidential Memorandum, “Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators,” directing federal agencies to take steps to protect and restore domestic populations of pollinators.<sup>85</sup> It established a Pollinator Health Task Force, co-chaired by USDA and EPA, with representatives from the Departments of State, Defense, Interior, Housing and Urban Development, Transportation,

<sup>82</sup> National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, *Status of Pollinators in North America*, 2006.

<sup>83</sup> Interview with Maryann Frazier, Senior Extension Agent, Pennsylvania State University, January 28, 2007.

<sup>84</sup> Testimony of Jeff Pettis, USDA, at a House Agriculture Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture hearing, April 29, 2014.

<sup>85</sup> The White House, “Presidential Memorandum—Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators,” June 20, 2014, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/20/presidential-memorandum-creating-federal-strategy-promote-health-honey-b>. For general information on presidential memoranda, see CRS Report RS20846, *Executive Orders: Issuance, Modification, and Revocation*.



Energy, and Education; Council on Environmental Quality; Domestic Policy Council; General Services Administration; National Science Foundation; the National Security Council Staff; Office of Management and Budget; and Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The task force is directed to develop a National Pollinator Health Strategy, which would include a Pollinator Research Action Plan to “focus federal efforts on understanding, preventing, and recovering from pollinator losses.” The action plan is to be informed by studies of the health of managed honey bees and native bees; expanded collection and sharing of data related to pollinator losses; assessments of the status of native pollinators; strategies for developing affordable seed mixes; identification of existing and new methods and best practices to reduce pollinator exposure to pesticides; and strategies for targeting resources toward areas of high risk and habitat restoration potential. The strategy is to also include public education plans for individuals and businesses to help address the loss of pollinators as well as recommendations for developing public-private partnerships to build on federal efforts to encourage pollinator protection and increase the quality and amount of habitat and forage for pollinators.

The task force member agency will develop plans to increase and improve pollinator habitat. These plans may include “facility landscaping, including easements; land management; policies with respect to road and other rights-of-way; educational gardens; use of integrated vegetation and pest management; increased native vegetation; and application of pollinator-friendly best management practices and seed mixes.” Member agencies are to also “evaluate permit and management practices on power line, pipeline, utility, and other rights-of-way and easements” and “make any necessary and appropriate changes to enhance pollinator habitat on federal lands through the use of integrated vegetation and pest management and pollinator-friendly best management practices” by “supplementing existing agreements and memoranda of understanding with rights-of-way holders” to establish and improve pollinator habitat.

The National Pollinator Health Strategy was scheduled to have been released in December 2014, but the report’s release date has been delayed to spring 2015.<sup>86</sup>

In October 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the General Services Administration (GSA) issued an addendum to its sustainable landscape guidance, *Supporting the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators*, to help federal agencies “incorporate pollinator friendly practices in new construction, building renovations, landscaping improvements, and in facility leasing agreements at federal facilities and on federal lands.”<sup>87</sup> This amends previous guidance from CEQ in October 2011 (*Guidance for Federal Agencies on Sustainable Practices for Designed Landscapes*), describing strategies to achieve sustainable federal landscape practices on more than 41 million acres of land and 429,000 building assets, comprising 3.34 billion square feet of space in the United States, that are controlled or owned by the federal government.

In November 2014, USDA and EPA held a number of public listening sessions to inform the task force members. Concerns about pesticide use were among the major discussion points. Commercial beekeepers and environmental groups continue to push for restrictions on pesticide

---

<sup>86</sup> Announcement by Michael Stebbins, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, at the 14<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC), October 22, 2014.

<sup>87</sup> CEQ, “Guidance for Federal Agencies on Sustainable Practices for Designed Landscapes and Supporting Pollinators on Federal Landscapes,” <http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/sustainability/landscaping-guidance> and [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/supporting\\_the\\_health\\_of\\_honey\\_bees\\_and\\_other\\_pollinators.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/supporting_the_health_of_honey_bees_and_other_pollinators.pdf). Involvement from other federal agencies included representatives from USDA and the U.S. Forest Service, the Smithsonian Institution, U.S. Botanic Garden, U.S. Geological Survey, the National Science Foundation, and the Departments of Transportation, Defense, Education, Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Interior’s Office of Planning and Management, with support from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

use, while grower and pesticide industry groups continue to encourage broader consideration beyond pesticides.<sup>88</sup>

Other concerns have been raised by conservation groups and land managers regarding the possibility that commercial beekeepers will be given expanded access to public lands for foraging and habitat, which might heighten potential interspecies competition between native bees and honey bees.<sup>89</sup> In October 2014, USDA and other federal agencies participated in a “Honey Bee Forage and Nutrition Summit” to highlight existing policies and programs and discuss ways to improve federal programmatic efforts in establishing forage plantings for honey bees and other pollinators.<sup>90</sup> Representatives from USDA discussed ongoing agency efforts to improve nutrition and forage for pollinators through EQIP and the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), among other USDA conservation programs. Other agencies described similar ongoing efforts on federal lands, including representatives from the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service.

## USDA-EPA Joint Report

In 2013, USDA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a USDA-EPA Joint report, *National Stakeholders Conference on Honey Bee Health*.<sup>91</sup> Among the goals of the conference were to “synthesize the current state of knowledge regarding CCD, bee pests, pathogens, and nutrition, potential pesticide effects on bees, and bee biology, genetics and breeding.” A summary of the key findings of the 2013 USDA-EPA Joint report, as reported by EPA, is as follows:<sup>92</sup>

- **Address Risks to Honey bees from Parasites and Disease.** According to the report, the parasitic *Varroa* mite is recognized as “the major factor underlying colony loss” in the United States and in other countries. Moreover, there is “widespread resistance to the chemicals beekeepers use to control mites within the hive,” and new virus species have been found in the U.S. and several of these have been associated with CCD.
- **Need for Increased Genetic Diversity in Bee Colonies.** Genetic variation improves bees’ thermoregulation,<sup>93</sup> disease resistance, and worker productivity in colonies, and bee breeding should emphasize traits (such as hygienic behavior) that confer improved resistance to *Varroa* mites and diseases.
- **Need for Improved Nutrition for Honey Bees.** Nutrition has a major impact on individual bee and colony longevity, and a poor diet can make bees more susceptible to harm from disease and parasites. Bees need better forage and a variety of plants to support colony health, and federal and state programs should consider land management strategies that maximize available nutritional forage and to protect bees by keeping them away from pesticide-treated fields.

<sup>88</sup> J.R. Pegg, “Neonicotinoid Controversy Hits Pollinator Health,” *Food Chemical News*, December 3, 2014.

<sup>89</sup> See, for example, T. Stecker, “Policy Fight Looms as Agencies Treat honeybee—a 17<sup>th</sup>-century import—as Exotic Invader,” *Energy and Environmental Policy News*, December 2, 2014.

<sup>90</sup> Comments by USDA representatives, “Honey Bee Forage and Nutrition Summit,” October 20, Alexandria VA.

<sup>91</sup> USDA, *Report on the National Stakeholders Conference on Honey Bee Health*, National Honey Bee Health Stakeholder Conference Steering Committee, May 2013, <http://www.usda.gov/documents/ReportHoneyBeeHealth.pdf>.

<sup>92</sup> EPA news release, “USDA and EPA Release New Report on Honey Bee Health,” May 2, 2013.

<sup>93</sup> Refers to the ability to keep body temperature steady even if the surrounding environment is different.

- **Need for Collaboration and Information Sharing.** Best Management Practices (BMPs) associated with pesticide use and bees are known but are not widely or systematically followed by U.S. crop producers. “Informed and coordinated communication between growers and beekeepers” is needed, along with “effective collaboration between stakeholders on practices to protect bees from pesticides.” Beekeepers have identified the need for “accurate and timely bee kill incident reporting, monitoring, and enforcement.”
- **Additional Pesticide Research Needed.** According to EPA: “The most pressing pesticide research questions relate to determining actual pesticide exposures and effects of pesticides on bees in the field and the potential for impacts on bee health and productivity of whole honey bee colonies.”

The National Honey Bee Health Stakeholder Conference Steering Committee is made up of representatives from Pennsylvania State University; from USDA’s Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP), National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS); and from EPA’s Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP).

Much of the current research on bee health is being conducted by scientists at USDA and its Beltsville bee laboratory, the USDA-supported Bee Informed Partnership, and scientists at many of the land-grant universities nationwide.

## USDA Actions and Funding

### CCD Action Plan

USDA released its initial action plan for addressing CCD in July 2007. USDA’s action plan focuses on improving coordination and redirecting existing resources and research for mitigation and prevention, including education and outreach, as well as expanding research and diagnostic resources to prevent future losses, working with the land grant universities. It also coordinates activities across three USDA agencies: Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA).

Under the plan, USDA would (1) conduct surveys and collect data on bee health; (2) analyze bee samples for pests, disease-causing pathogens, pesticide exposure, and other factors; (3) conduct controlled experiments to identify factors affecting bee health, including potential causes of colony collapses; and (4) develop best management practices and guidelines to improve general bee health and reduce susceptibility to colony collapses and other disorders among both honey bees and non-*Apis* bees.<sup>94</sup> Since 2009, USDA has published a series of annual progress reports on its CCD research.<sup>95</sup> The progress reports provide detailed information on the status of ongoing research under each of the four elements of USDA’s action plan, including survey and (sample) data collection, analysis of existing samples, research to identify factors affecting honey bee health, and mitigative and preventive measures.

<sup>94</sup> USDA, CCD Steering Committee, “Colony Collapse Disorder Action Plan,” June 20, 2007, [http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccd\\_actionplan.pdf](http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/br/ccd/ccd_actionplan.pdf).

<sup>95</sup> USDA, *Colony Collapse Disorder Progress Report*, various years, available at <http://www.ars.usda.gov/News/docs.htm?docid=15572>.

## Funding to Address Pollinator Concerns

Funding for honey bee and pollinator research at USDA's ARS has increased since the enactment of the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246) and in subsequent appropriations, which, among other things, provide additional funding for research and conservation programs addressing honey bees and pollinators. Total ARS funding for honey bee research has been as follows:<sup>96</sup>

- FY2007 - \$7,675,000
- FY2008 - \$7,798,000
- FY2009 - \$8,290,000
- FY2010 - \$10,000,000
- FY2011 - \$9,980,000 (reduction in funding was due to the FY2011 rescission)
- FY2012 - \$10,128,000
- FY2013 - \$9,353,000 (reduction in funding was due to sequestration and rescission); and
- FY2014 - \$10,309,000.

Of these annual amounts, about \$3 million is spent to address the *Varroa* mite.<sup>97</sup> ARS also has an "Area-wide Project on Bee Health," which consists of temporary funding of about \$1.3 million in FY2013. Additional funding is available to USDA's NIFA, and includes combined research on honey bees, funding specific to CCD and bee and pollinator health, including funding for various research labs and grants. Emerging issues grants have been awarded to Penn State University and the University of Georgia to study the effects of pesticides, pathogens, and miticides on pollinator populations.<sup>98</sup>

Additional funding has been allocated in conjunction with the release of the June 2014 Presidential Memorandum. For example, USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) awarded another \$4 million in technical and financial assistance to farmers and ranchers to improve the health of honey focusing on crop production in five midwestern states: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.<sup>99</sup> USDA's Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) also provided \$8 million in incentives for Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin farmers and ranchers who establish new habitats for declining honey bee populations.<sup>100</sup> NIFA also provided a \$6.9 million grant to Michigan State University to develop sustainable pollination strategies for U.S. specialty crops funded through the Specialty Crop Research Initiative.<sup>101</sup> This additional funding is part of the Administration's FY2015 proposal to provide up to \$70 million to focus broadly on pollinator declines, which includes a

---

<sup>96</sup> CRS communication with USDA personnel, December 18, 2009.

<sup>97</sup> Testimony of Jeff Pettis, USDA, at a House Agriculture Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture hearing, April 29, 2014.

<sup>98</sup> Statements by Jeff Pettis, USDA, to Senate Environment and Public Works committee staff, April 9, 2008.

<sup>99</sup> USDA press release, "USDA to Provide \$4 million For Honey Bee Habitat," October 29, 2014.

<sup>100</sup> USDA press release, "USDA Provides \$8 Million to Help Boost Declining Honey Bee Population," June 20, 2014.

<sup>101</sup> USDA press release, "USDA Awards Grant to Michigan State University to Study Pollination Solutions for Specialty Crops," August 6, 2014. Other funding includes \$45 million in combined mandatory and discretionary funds for USDA and EPA (see USDA, *FY2015 Budget Summary and Annual Performance Plan*, April 2014).

proposed initiative to create a \$25 million competitive program administered by NIFA (“Innovative Institute on Pollination and Pollinator Health”).<sup>102</sup>

Some beekeepers will also receive disaster assistance aid through the USDA’s Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honeybees, and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP). (For more information, see “Insurance and Disaster Provisions.”)

Some states and/or state beekeeper associations are also providing grant money to new and existing beekeepers to purchase new hives or additional equipment and beekeeping supplies, or to maintain local queen breeding groups that support local beekeeping communities.<sup>103</sup>

In addition, in January 2014, EPA announced it had awarded nearly \$500,000 in agricultural grants for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices to reduce the use of potentially harmful pesticides and lower risk to bees. The IPM grants were awarded to Louisiana State and Penn State University, and University of Vermont.<sup>104</sup>

## Issues for Congress

Following concerns over honey bee colony losses in 2006-2007, Congress provided for increased funding for bee research, among other types of farm program support to protect pollinators, as part of the 2008 farm bill. Given continued concerns about the health and well-being of honey bees and other pollinators, this issue has continued to be legislatively active in Congress, and various proposals were again considered as part of farm bill debates in both the House and Senate in 2013. For the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, the incoming chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research has said that bee health will be a top issue for his subcommittee.<sup>105</sup> In addition, various other legislative proposals have been considered outside the farm bill debate that could broadly support other types of bee and pollinator protections and habitat areas.

## Farm Bill Provisions

The Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79, H.Rept. 113-333), referred to here as the “2014 farm bill,” is the most recent omnibus farm bill. It was enacted in February 2014 and succeeded the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-246, “2008 farm bill”).<sup>106</sup> The 2014 farm bill reauthorized and expanded many of the 2008 farm bill provisions that address honey bees and pollinators as part of the law’s research, conservation, specialty crop, and miscellaneous title provisions. Overall, regarding managed honey bees and native pollinators, the 2014 farm bill:

---

<sup>102</sup> USDA, NIFA, “2015 Explanatory Notes,” <http://www.obpa.usda.gov/19nifa2015notes.pdf>, p. 19-38.

<sup>103</sup> See, for example, Virginia’s Beehive Grant Program, <http://www.vdacs.virginia.gov/plant&pest/hivegrant.shtml>; Tennessee’s Hive Grant, <http://cookevillebeekeepers.com/tba-hive-grant>; and Washington State beekeepers Association grants, <http://wasba.org/about-wsba/wsba-grants/>.

<sup>104</sup> EPA press release, “EPA Awards Almost Half a Million in Funding to Three Universities for Projects to Reduce Pesticide Risk Including Risks to Bees,” January 8, 2014.

<sup>105</sup> T. Stecker, “New House Subcommittee Chief will Push Forward on Bee Issues,” *Environmental and Energy Policy*, December 16, 2014. See also “Subcommittee Examines Research Efforts to Combat Pests and Diseases of Pollinators,” House Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture hearing, April 29, 2014.

<sup>106</sup> For more information, see CRS Report R43076, *The 2014 Farm Bill (P.L. 113-79): Summary and Side-by-Side*. Many of these provisions were broadly extended through FY2013, as part of the one-year extension of the farm bill extension in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (ATRA, P.L. 112-240).

- extends through 2018 various USDA research and conservation provisions directed at protecting pollinators, enacted in the 2008 farm bill (see “Research Provisions” and “Conservation Provisions,” below, for more information);
- expands annual reporting requirements on CCD along with other health disorders;
- requires USDA to publish guidance on enhancing long-term pollinator health and long term viability of pollinators, including addressing habitat and forage needs for native pollinators and managed honey bees; and
- requires USDA to assess federal efforts to mitigate pollinator losses and threats to the U.S. commercial beekeeping industry, and to recommend how to better coordinate federal agency efforts to address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators.

Some proposed provisions were not included in the 2014 farm bill. In particular, a House-passed provision, Protection of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators,<sup>107</sup> would have required USDA, in consultations with the Department of the Interior and EPA, to take measures to improve federal coordination in addressing the documented decline of managed and native pollinators and promote the long-term viability of honey bee, wild bees and other beneficial insects in agriculture. The provision also would have required USDA to establish a federal task force on bee health and commercial beekeeping to coordinate and assess efforts to mitigate pollinator losses, and the task force is to submit a report to Congress within 180 days of enactment of the farm bill, as well as conduct a study to consider relocating and modernizing pollinator research labs.

## **Research Provisions**

The research title of the 2008 farm bill identified pollinator protection among its so-called high-priority research and extension areas (P.L. 110-246, §7204). It provided for research and extension grants (1) to survey and collect data on bee colony production and health; (2) to investigate pollinator biology, immunology, ecology, genomics, and bioinformatics; (3) to conduct research on various factors that may be contributing to or associated with colony collapse disorder and other serious threats to the health of honey bees and other pollinators, including parasites and pathogens of pollinators, and the sublethal effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides on honey bees and native and managed pollinators; (4) to develop mitigative and preventative measures to improve native and managed pollinator health; and (5) to promote the health of honey bees and native pollinators through habitat conservation and best management practices.<sup>108</sup> The 2008 farm bill authorized appropriations for grants at \$10 million annually for FY2008-FY2013.

The research provisions also directed USDA to increase its capacity and infrastructure to address colony collapse disorder and other long-term threats to pollinator health (including hiring additional personnel) and to conduct research on colony collapse disorder and other pollinator issues at USDA’s facilities. As amended, annual appropriations were authorized at \$7.25 million (FY2008-FY2013), with another \$2.75 million annually (FY2008-FY2013) for honey bee pest and pathogen surveillance. This authorized funding has supported honey bee and pollinator research efforts at USDA’s ARS in recent years (see “Funding”).

---

<sup>107</sup> House-Passed 2013 farm bill, H.R. 2642, including text of H.R. 3102 (§12315).

<sup>108</sup> 7 U.S.C. §5925.



The 2008 farm bill also directed USDA to submit an annual report to Congress on its response to CCD, indicating that the report should investigate the cause(s) of honey bee colony collapse and recommend appropriate strategies to reduce colony loss (see “CCD Action Plan”).

The 2014 farm bill reiterated that USDA should continue to focus its research efforts on honey bees and native pollinators (P.L. 113-79, §7209). First, the farm bill reauthorized and expanded the “high-priority research and extension initiatives” at USDA regarding honey bees, including the requirement that USDA conduct a nationwide “honey bee pest, pathogen, health, and population status surveillance” program, among other efforts intended to counteract the declining honey bee health and declining populations of honey bees and native pollinators. Second, the farm bill reauthorized and expanded on the requirement that USDA submit an annual report describing honey bee colony collapse and honey bee health disorders, and find appropriate strategies, including best management practices (BMPs) to reduce colony losses, and address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators. USDA’s report must also assess federal efforts to mitigate pollinator losses and threats to the United States commercial beekeeping industry and recommend to Congress how to better coordinate federal agency efforts.

The 2014 farm bill provision in the Research title extended each of the authorized appropriations in the 2008 farm bill.<sup>109</sup> Total authorized appropriations are \$20 million annually through FY2018, and include

- research and extension activities (\$10 million annually);
- USDA capacity and infrastructure (\$7.25 million annually); and
- honey bee surveillance (\$2.75 million annually).

Third, the farm bill directed USDA to consult with the Department of the Interior and EPA, and publish “guidance on enhancing pollinator health and the long-term viability of populations of pollinators,” including recommendations related to allowing for managed honey bees to forage on National Forest System (NFS) lands. Under current law, honey bees can be allowed on NFS lands under a “special use authorization permit.”<sup>110</sup>

## **Conservation Provisions**

The conservation title of the 2008 farm bill included language that broadly encourages habitat development and protection among the administrative requirements for native and managed pollinators under USDA’s conservation programs (P.L. 110-246, §2708), and ensures that USDA’s conservation technical assistance includes standards that account for native and managed pollinators (P.L. 110-246, §2706). These provisions could broaden the focus of USDA’s farm conservation programs to include pollinator habitats and habitat improvement among their goals, as well as require USDA to review its conservation practice standards with respect to managed and native pollinators.

The 2014 farm bill generally continued these types of protections. In February 2014, USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) announced that it would provide nearly \$3 million in technical and financial assistance for farmers and ranchers through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) to help promote the health of honey bees by implementing conservation practices that provide bees with forage areas while providing other

---

<sup>109</sup> 7 U.S.C. 5925(G) (High-Priority Research and Extension Initiatives; Pollinator Protection).

<sup>110</sup> For more information, see USDA, Forest Service, “Obtaining a Special-Use Authorization with the Forest Service: The Application Process,” <http://www.fs.fed.us/specialuses/documents/broch.htm>.

environmental benefits. This funding is targeted in five midwestern states: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.<sup>111</sup> In October 2014, USDA will be providing more than \$4 million in technical and financial assistance to farmers and ranchers in these states to improve honey bee health. USDA notes that this effort contributes to the efforts of the Presidential Memorandum to create a federal strategy to promote the health of honey bees and other pollinators.<sup>112</sup>

The need for habitat and forage areas for native pollinators and managed honey bees—to supply pollen and nectar to address the nutritional needs of bees and other pollinators—continues to be an important policy issue. Some advocacy groups asked USDA to convene a “Honey Bee Nutrition and Forage Summit” to examine the importance of nutrition and forage to the health of honey bees and sustainable agricultural pollination services,<sup>113</sup> which USDA hosted in October 2014. Forage efforts are also being considered in some state legislatures including in California to help address pollination service needs. USDA is also focusing on forage areas as part of its conservation programs; see “National Pollinator Health Strategy (“Presidential Memorandum”).”

## **Insurance and Disaster Provisions**

Other provisions in the 2008 farm bill supported pollinators through the bill’s crop insurance and other disaster assistance provisions. One such provision identifies honey farms as possible beneficiaries of the bill’s supplemental agricultural disaster assistance (P.L. 110-246, §12033); another provision provides contracts for additional policies and studies to carry out research and development regarding insurance policies that cover loss of bees (P.L. 110-246, §12023).

As authorized by the 2008 farm bill, USDA established the Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honey Bees, and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP).<sup>114</sup> This program, administered by USDA’s Farm Service Agency (FSA), provides emergency relief to producers of livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish to aid in the reduction of losses caused by disease, adverse weather, or other natural disaster conditions, such as blizzards and wildfires. Eligible honey bee producers—those who incur physical losses of honey bees and honey bee hives because of colony collapse disorder—must provide documentation, and/or a certification that the loss of honey bees was due to CCD, from one or more of the following: registered entomologist; cooperative extension specialist; and/or land grant university. Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance under ELAP initially covered certain losses that occurred on or after January 1, 2008, and before October 1, 2011. ELAP expired in 2011.

The 2014 farm bill reinstated ELAP retroactively to a period covering October 2011 through September 2018, providing up to \$20 million annually in mandatory funding to compensate producers for disaster losses not covered under other disaster programs (P.L. 113-79, §1501). Beekeepers with dead bees may be eligible for payments under ELAP. Among eligible causes of bee loss are those that are a “direct result of an eligible adverse weather or loss condition, including but not limited to, colony collapse disorder (CCD) (colony loss only), earthquake,

---

<sup>111</sup> USDA press release, “Agriculture Secretary Announces \$3 Million for a New Program to Improve Pollinator Health,” February 25, 2014. See also Honey Bee Pollinator Guidance, FY2014 (NB 300-14-14 LTP), January 2014.

<sup>112</sup> USDA, NRCS, “USDA to provide \$4 million for honey bee habitat,” October 29, 2014.

<sup>113</sup> Letter to Tom Vilsack, USDA Secretary, by numerous groups including the Pollinator Partnership, the American Beekeeping Federation, and the American Honey Producers Association, January 15, 2014. A “Varroa Mite Summit” is currently being organized by USDA.

<sup>114</sup> USDA, “Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honeybees, and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP),” October 2011. For more information, see CRS Report RS21212, *Agricultural Disaster Assistance*.



eligible winter storm (colony loss only), excessive wind, flood, hurricane, lightning, tornado, volcanic eruption or wildfire natural disasters as well as colony collapse disorder.”<sup>115</sup> Eligible honeybees under ELAP include “bees housed in a managed hive and used for honey production, pollination or honeybee breeding” and do not include “wild, feral honeybees, leaf cutter bees or other bee species that are not used for producing honey, pollinating or breeding honeybees.”

Under ELAP, FSA provides payments for honey bee colony or hive losses:

- ELAP payments for honey bee *colony losses* are based on a minimum of 75% of the number of honeybee colonies lost in excess of normal mortality (17.5%)<sup>116</sup> due to an eligible adverse weather or loss condition, multiplied by the average fair market value per honeybee colony for the applicable program year.
- ELAP payments for honey bee *hive losses* are based on a minimum of 75% of the number of honeybee hives lost due to an eligible adverse weather or loss condition, multiplied by the average fair market value per honeybee hive for the applicable program year.

For the 2012-2014 program years, the FSA-established average fair market values ranged from \$75 to \$85 per colony, and ranged from \$210 to \$230 per hive. ELAP also compensates eligible beekeepers based on a minimum of 60% of the actual cost of purchased or harvested feed that was intended for honey bees but damaged due to an eligible adverse weather or loss condition. Certain payment eligibility and limits may apply.

In November 2014, USDA announced that nearly 2,500 applicants will receive disaster assistance aid through ELAP for losses suffered from October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2013.<sup>117</sup>

## **Other Farm Bill Provisions**

The 2014 farm bill also requires that USDA submit to the Food and Drug Administration a report that describes an appropriate federal standard for the identity of honey, including consideration of the March 2006 Standard of Identity citizens petition filed with FDA (P.L. 113-79, §10012). The agency published a notice to solicit public comments on “how a federal standard of identity for honey would be in the interest of consumers, the honey industry, and U.S. agriculture.”<sup>118</sup> (“Standard of Identity” broadly refers to establishing definitions and standards for commodities such as honey.)

The 2008 farm bill also contained provisions that generally support honey production. These include, for example, provisions pertaining to the National Honey Board (P.L. 110-246, §§10401-10402); provisions covering rates for marketing assistance loans for certain commodities, including honey (P.L. 110-246, §1202); and provisions covering certain nutrition title provisions (such as P.L. 110-246, §4231).

---

<sup>115</sup> USDA factsheet, “Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honeybees and Farm-Raised Fish Program (ELAP), Honeybee Assistance,” April 2014, [http://www.fsa.usda.gov/Internet/FSA\\_File/elap\\_honeybee\\_fact\\_sht.pdf](http://www.fsa.usda.gov/Internet/FSA_File/elap_honeybee_fact_sht.pdf). Beekeepers can contact their local USDA/FSA office to apply (<http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=fsa>).

<sup>116</sup> FSA has established a normal mortality rate for honeybee colony losses of 17.5%.

<sup>117</sup> USDA, “USDA Disaster Assistance to Help Thousands of Honeybee, Livestock and Farm-Raised Fish Producers,” press release #0258.14, November 24, 2014.

<sup>118</sup> 79 *Federal Register* 161: 49279-49280, August 20, 2014.

## Other Legislative Proposals

Additional legislative proposals regarding honey bees and other pollinators have been offered outside of the farm bill debate.

In the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, Representative Alcee Hastings introduced H.R. 4790, Highways Bettering the Economy and Environment Act (or Highways BEE Act). The bill would promote conservation practices on 17 million acres of highway “rights-of-ways” (managed by state Departments of Transportation or state DOTs), and would promote native plantings that provide improved habitat, forage, and migratory corridors for pollinators, ground nesting birds, and other small wildlife, as well as encourage reduced mowing and overall maintenance costs to state DOTs. Roadsides are also recognized as a potential habitat for native wildlife, including pollinating insects.<sup>119</sup> The proposed bill language was not included as part of broader transportation legislation considered during the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress. The bill was also introduced in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress as H.R. 2381, and has been actively promoted by Pollinator Partnership/North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC).<sup>120</sup>

In the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, Representatives Earl Blumenauer and John Conyers, Jr. introduced H.R. 2692, Saving America’s Pollinators Act of 2013. The bill would suspend registrations of neonicotinoids and ban new registrations of any pesticide for use on “bee attractive plants, trees, and cereals” until the EPA determines that the insecticide will not cause “unreasonable adverse effects” on pollinators, including native bees, honey bees, and other beneficial insects, as well as birds and bats. The bill also would require the Department of the Interior to coordinate with EPA in monitoring the health and populations of native bees, and annually report to Congress on their health and population status. This bill is in part a response to reports that 50,000 bees were found dead in a suburban shopping-center parking lot in Oregon in June 2013, reportedly due to exposure to pesticides used on trees near the parking lot to control aphids.<sup>121</sup>

Also in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, Representative Austin Scott introduced H.R. 5447, which would amend U.S. pesticide laws to provide for expedited registration of pesticides that “improve managed pollinator bee health, including managing resistance to parasitic pests,” and for expedited application for a pesticide registration that is “reasonably expected to improve the health of managed pollinator bees, including managing resistance to parasitic pests of managed pollinator bees.” The bill would also require USDA and EPA to submit reports to Congress on the “extent and scope of the threat to the health of managed pollinator bees” and the availability of pesticides to manage bee pests, particularly the *Varroa* mite.

---

<sup>119</sup> R. Conniff, Green Highways: New Strategies to Manage Roadsides as Habitat,” *environment360*, Yale University, June 10, 2013, [http://e360.yale.edu/feature/green\\_highways\\_new\\_strategies\\_to\\_manage\\_roadsides\\_as\\_habitat/2661/](http://e360.yale.edu/feature/green_highways_new_strategies_to_manage_roadsides_as_habitat/2661/).

<sup>120</sup> For information, see Pollinator Partnership/North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC), “Support Highways Bettering the Economy and Environment Act (Highways BEE Act),” <http://pollinator.org/BEEAct.htm>.

<sup>121</sup> See, for example, press release on the bill by Representative Earl Blumenauer’s office. For other related information, see CRS Report R42855, *Bee Health: The Role of Pesticides*.

## Author Information

Renée Johnson  
Specialist in Agricultural Policy

M. Lynne Corn  
Specialist in Natural Resources Policy

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.